

REMARKS

Applicants herein respond to the Office Action dated December 7, 2010 and relating to the matter captioned above. Claims 1 – 10, 12 and 13 are currently present in this application. Applicants thank the Examiner for finding allowable subject matter in claims 1, 6 – 10 and 12. Applicants apologize for the various errors and informalities in this application, and thank the Examiner for identifying same. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to accept the amendments presented above to address these errors and informalities. Applicants respectfully urge that none of these amendments present new matter. Applicants also note that a number of the changes this amendment presents correct trivial problems of support and antecedent basis not mentioned by the Examiner.

Applicants address the various issues the Office Action raises in the order presented by the Examiner. Regarding the objection to the drawings, applicants have amended Figure 2 to add a supply valve, reference number 23. A control signal on path 23A provided by controller 46 controls the open/closed state of valve 23. The description has been appropriately amended to reflect this added material. Given that the original claim 1 referred to “valve means” for “switching the flow of gas. . .” applicants believe this amendment of the drawing and description simply expand on matter always present in the application.

The Examiner properly objects to the replication of text at the end of p. 7 and the start of p. 8. The above amendment corrects this error.

Applicants amend the application to provide a detailed description of the operation of the valve switching means and the supply valve. This description simply enlarges on the disclosure in the Brief Description and thus does not present new matter. Applicants note that the test here

is whether a person of skill in the art could practice the invention using the original disclosure. Applicants believe that this is clearly so, observing that the §112 standard for adequate disclosure is the relatively high “skill in the art” rather than the presumably lesser “ordinary skill in the art” of §103, which lesser skill is still interpreted to be a quite high level.

Applicants have deleted the term “preferably” from claim 2, leading them to believe that claims 2 – 4 are now in condition for allowance.

Applicants again note that the description and claims have been amended in a number of trivial ways to restore appropriate breadth to the scope of coverage and to provide antecedent basis for terms previously lacking same. In particular, applicants note that certain limitations unrelated to the subject matter of the invention have been removed from claims 1 and 10.

Applicants again thank the Examiner for his courtesies. In view of the forgoing, applicants believe this case is now in condition for allowance, and respectfully request the Examiner to so find.

Please charge any deficiencies or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 14-0620.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony CHAN et al.

By their attorney

Date April 4, 2011

/Edward L. Schwarz/

Reg. No. 25,652

NAWROCKI, ROONEY & SIVERTSON, P.A.

Suite 401, Broadway Place East

3433 Broadway St. N.E.

Minneapolis, MN 55413

Customer No. 05909

(612) 331-1464